

1 WO
2
3
4
5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8 Arturo A. Canez,) No. 12-CV-2232-PHX-PGR (SPL)
9 Petitioner,)
10 v.)
11 Charles L. Ryan, et. al.,)
12 Respondents.)
13

14
15 **ORDER**

16 Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Logan (Doc.
17 32), which addresses Petitioner's First Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, filed
18 February 25, 2013, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. 12). Petitioner filed objections to the
19 Report and Recommendation. (Doc. 34.)

20 Magistrate Judge Logan recommends that the Court deny the petition as barred by
21 the one-year statute of limitations set forth in the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty
22 Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(A). Magistrate Judge Logan concludes that Petitioner is not
23 eligible for statutory or equitable tolling. Having reviewed the matter *de novo*, the Court will
adopt the Report and Recommendation.

24 Petitioner's convictions and sentences became final on October 7, 2011.¹ The
25 limitations period was statutorily tolled until April 29, 2011, when Petitioner's timely-filed
26

27 ¹ On September 10, 2007, the Arizona Court of Appeals affirmed Petitioner's life
28 sentence for first-degree murder. *State v. Canez*, 2007 WL 5595966 (App. 2007). Petitioner's
conviction became final 30 days later. See Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.19(a)

1 petition for postconviction relief was denied. (Doc. 20-2, Ex. P.) Petitioner filed his petition
 2 for habeas corpus relief on October 18, 2012 (Doc. 1), nearly six months after the limitations
 3 period expired.

4 For the reasons set forth in the Report and Recommendation, Petitioner's argument
 5 for additional statutory tolling fails because after April 29, 2011, no timely petition for
 6 review was pending. (*See* Doc. 32 at 14–15; Doc. 20-2, Ex. R.) Petitioner's arguments for
 7 equitable tolling fail to meet the exceptionally high burden required for a showing that he had
 8 been “pursuing his rights diligently” and that “some extraordinary circumstances stood in
 9 [his] way.” *Pace v. DiGuglielmo*, 544 U.S. 408, 418–19 (2005); *see, e.g., Law v. Lamarque*,
 10 351 F.3d 919, 922 (9th Cir. 2003); *Whalem/Hunt v. Early*, 233 F.3d 1146, 1148 (9th Cir.
 11 2000). Finally, Petitioner's actual innocence argument fails because it is not supported by
 12 new evidence showing factual innocence. *See Schlup v. Delo*, 513 U.S. 298, 324 (1995).

13 Accordingly,

14 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Logan's Report and
 15 Recommendation (Doc. 32) is **accepted** and **adopted** by the Court.

16 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's First Amended Petition for Writ of
 17 Habeas Corpus is **dismissed** and **denied** with prejudice. (Doc. 12.)

18 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED **denying** a Certificate of Appealability and **denying**
 19 leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal because Petitioner has not made a substantial
 20 showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

21 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED **granting** Petitioner's motion for an extension of the
 22 deadline for responding to the Report and Recommendation. (Doc. 12.)

23 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall close this case.

24 DATED this 12th day of June, 2014.

25
 26 
 27 Paul G. Rosenblatt
 28 United States District Judge